

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Notice of Allowance is in reply to the Applicant's amendments filed on 1 March 2010.
2. No claims have been amended.
3. Claim 75 has been cancelled.
4. Claims 1, 6, 9-20, 35, 40, 43-71, and 74 had been previously allowed.
5. Claims 20 and 76 are allowed.

Response to Amendment

6. In the previous office action, Claim 75 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Since the Applicants have cancelled Claim 75, the rejection is moot.
7. Applicants have submitted an up-dated oath of declaration filed 1 March 2010 and is acknowledged by the Examiner.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

8. An Examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
Authorization for this Examiner's amendment was given in telephone interviews with Jeremy Monaldo, Applicants' Representative on 22 October 2009 and 28 May 2010.

The application has been amended as follows:

In the claim(s):

20. (Currently amended) A non-transitory computer program product, tangibly embodied in computer-readable medium, the non-transitory computer program product being operable to cause a data processing apparatus to:

access, from electronic storage, a public sector value model that corresponds to a public sector organization and that defines:

at least two outcome measures that each correspond to a non-monetary social benefit achieved by the public sector organization,

weightings that correspond to each of the outcome measures and that define a relative weight given to the corresponding outcome measure, the weightings reflecting relative significance of the corresponding non-monetary social benefit to public value provided by the public sector organization, and

at least one cost-effectiveness measure that relates to costs incurred by the public sector organization in achieving the outcomes and that includes reduction of variable cost, reduction of fixed cost, and increase in asset efficiency;

obtain, from public data sources, performance measurements corresponding to the at least two outcome measures, the performance measurements being indicative of the public sector organization's level of achievement of the non-monetary social benefits corresponding to the at least two outcome measures;

obtain cost measurements corresponding to the at least one cost-effectiveness measure, the cost measurements being indicative of the public sector organization's variable costs, fixed costs, and available assets;

compute, using the public sector value model, a performance value by removing impact of exogenous factors on the performance measurements corresponding to the at least two outcome measures and applying the corresponding weightings to the performance measurements, the exogenous factors being factors that affect the performance measurements corresponding to the at least two outcome measures, but are not the responsibility of the public sector organization;

compute, using the public sector value model, a cost-effectiveness value as a ratio of the computed performance value and an operating cost of the public sector organization determined using the obtained cost measurements;

determine a relative public performance measure of the public sector organization based on the computed performance value, an average performance value relevant to the public sector organization, the computed cost-effectiveness value, and an average cost-effectiveness value relevant to the public sector organization;

generate, based on the determined relative public performance measure of the public sector organization, a public sector value matrix that graphically reflects the computed performance value for the public sector organization relative to the average performance value and that graphically reflects the computed cost-effectiveness value for the public sector organization relative to the average cost-effectiveness value;

compare the relative public performance measure of the public sector organization with performance trends; and

based on the comparison of the relative public performance measure of the public sector organization with performance trends, identify a recommendation on how the public sector organization can improve the relative public performance measure,

wherein removing the impact of exogenous factors on the performance measurements corresponding to the at least two outcome measures comprises developing a final performance score for each of the at least two outcome measures that takes into account an understanding of a relationship between key socioeconomic factors and the non-monetary social benefits that correspond to the at least two outcome measures.

9. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The present invention is directed to a system and method for generating a public sector value model that corresponds to a public sector organization that includes at least two outcome measures that each correspond to non-monetary social benefits and at least one cost-effectiveness measure that relates to costs incurred by the public sector organization and identifies a recommendation on how the public sector organization can improve its relative public performance measure based on a final performance score from the outcome measures.

The closest prior art, Mechling et al., "Defining and Measuring Success in Canadian Public Sector Electronic Service Directory", Issue Paper Prepared for Discussion and Debate at Lac Carling V, April 24, 2001, Spears et al., "Citizens First 2000", Public Sector Service Delivery Council and The Public Administration of Canada, 2001. The analogous art of Mechling et al. is directed to measuring progress and indicating measurement gaps by profiling government and electronic service delivery in the Canadian public sector. The analogous art of Spears et al. is directed to conducting a survey to develop a better understanding of how citizens access and use government services to improve service quality. Mechling et al. in view of Spears et al. fail to teach or suggest either singularly or in combination a system/method for the public sector value model outcome measures based on non-monetary social benefits that are weighted that reflect relative significance to public value provided by a public sector organization comprising:

at least one cost-effectiveness measure that relates to costs incurred by the public sector organization in achieving the outcomes and that includes reduction of variable cost, reduction of fixed cost, and increase in asset efficiency;

obtaining, using a computer processor and from public data sources, performance measurements corresponding to the at least two outcome measures, the performance measurements being indicative of the public sector organization's level of achievement of the non-monetary social benefits corresponding to the at least two outcome measures;

obtaining, using the computer processor, cost measurements corresponding to the at least one cost-effectiveness measure, the cost measurements being indicative of the public sector organization's variable costs, fixed costs, and available assets;

computing, using the computer processor and applying the public sector value model, a performance value by removing impact of exogenous factors on the performance measurements corresponding to the at least two outcome measures and applying the corresponding weightings to the performance measurements, the exogenous factors being factors that affect the performance measurements corresponding to the at least two outcome measures, but are not the responsibility of the public sector organization;

computing, using the computer processor and applying the public sector value model, a cost-effectiveness value as a ratio of the computed performance value and an operating cost of the public sector organization determined using the obtained cost measurements;

determining, using the computer processor, a relative public performance measure of the public sector organization based on the computed performance value, an average performance value relevant to the public sector organization, the computed cost-effectiveness value, and an average cost-effectiveness value relevant to the public sector organization;

generating, using the computer processor and based on the determined relative public performance measure of the public sector organization, a public sector value matrix that graphically reflects the computed performance value for the public sector organization relative to the average performance value and that graphically reflects the computed cost-effectiveness value for the public sector organization relative to the average cost-effectiveness value;

comparing, using the computer processor, the relative public performance measure of the public sector organization with performance trends; and

based on the comparison of the relative public performance measure of the public sector organization with performance trends, identifying, using the computer processor, a recommendation on how the public sector organization can improve the relative public performance measure,

wherein removing the impact of exogenous factors on the performance measurements corresponding to the at least two outcome measures comprises developing a final performance score for each of the at least two outcome measures that takes into account an understanding of a relationship between key socioeconomic factors and the non-monetary social benefits that correspond to the at least two outcome measures, as recited in independent Claims 1, 20, and 35. Dependent 6, 9-19, 40, 43-71, 74, and 76 are allowed because they depend from independent Claims 1, 20, and 35.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS MANSFIELD whose telephone number is (571)270-1904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30 am-6 pm, alt. Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on 571-272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

28 May 2010
Thomas Mansfield

/Beth V. Boswell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623